

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks. Claim 14 has been amended. The revision to claim 14 is supported, for example, at Figure 1B. Claims 14-20 are pending, with claim 14 being the sole independent claim.

Objections to the Drawings

The proposed drawing correction has been objected to by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Figure 4 was submitted with the Amendment and Response dated August 6, 2003. However, the Examiner refused entry of that figure. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and entry of Figure 4.

Applicants submit the specification and figures clearly describe a die shaped as shown in Figure 4. The outline of the sealing resin is determined by the shape of the dies. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the shape of the dies would be that shape which surrounds the sealing resin. The sealing resin 40 is depicted, for example at Figure 1B. The shape of the die shown in Figure 4 simply tracks the exterior of the sealing resin 40, as is depicted in Figure 1B.

Moreover, elements 91 and 92 are specifically described, for example, at page 13, lines 3-13, which discuss a top and bottom part of the die. Applicants disagree that the specification does not teach that the leads contact the top and bottom part of the die. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that in order to keep the sealing resin within the die after it is injected into the die, it is necessary to clamp the leads 10 and 20 from the top and bottom as shown in Figure 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 4 is fully supported by the specification and drawings.

Objection to the Specification

The abstract has been objected to by the Examiner. In particular, the Examiner has requested support for the previous amendment to the abstract. The previous amendment to the abstract is supported, for example, at page 3, lines 11-20 and at page 4, lines 15-20.

The Examiner has also objected to the amended sections of the specification that refer to amended Figure 4. In view of the comments above with respect to the Drawing objections, Applicants respectfully submit that the amended sections do not introduce new matter to the specification.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 14-20 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,349,238 ("*Ohsawa*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,857,483 ("*Steffen*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,277,225 ("*Kinsman*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 14 recites a method for manufacturing an electronic device. A first lead has an element placement pad. The first lead is bent in an S shape so as to extend within the package towards a side of the package that is opposite from a side where the electronic element is placed with respect to the element placement pad. By this arrangement, it is possible to achieve good adhesion strength between the leads and the sealing resin, and to also achieve good adhesion and filling in of solder when the device is mounted. *See, e.g.*, page 3, lines 2-8.

Ohsawa discloses a semiconductor device including a lead frame. *Ohsawa*, however, does not disclose or suggest that a first lead is bent in an S shape so as to extend within the package towards a side of the package that is opposite from a side where the electronic element is placed with respect to the element placement pad. In contrast, lead 4 of *Ohsawa* extends

within the package directly to the side. *See, e.g.*, Figure 1A. It does not extend within the package towards a side of the package that is opposite from a side where the electronic element is placed with respect to the element placement pad.

Nor does *Ohsawa* teach or suggest that a first lead has an element placement pad. In contrast, the element placement pad of *Ohsawa* (inner lead 6) is a different element than the first lead of *Ohsawa* (outer lead 4). *See, e.g.*, Figure 1A.

Neither *Steffen* nor *Kinsman* remedies the deficiencies of *Ohsawa*. *Steffen* discloses a method for encapsulating integrated circuits. *Steffen*, however, does not disclose or suggest that a first lead is bent in an S shape so as to extend within the package towards a side of the package that is opposite from a side where the electronic element is placed with respect to the element placement pad. *Kinsman* discloses a "lead over chip" semiconductor die assembly. *Kinsman*, however, does not disclose or suggest that a first lead is bent in an S shape so as to extend within the package towards a side of the package that is opposite from a side where the electronic element is placed with respect to the element placement pad.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that independent claim 14 is allowable over the cited art.


Claims 15-20 depend from claim 14 and are believed allowable for the same reasons. Moreover, each of these dependent claims recites additional features in combination with the features of claim 14, and is believed allowable in its own right. Individual consideration of these dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: March 25, 2004



Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM:DTL